

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

JANE ROE, et al

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI,

Defendant

Case No. 1:22-cv-376

Judge: Matthew W. McFarland

RESPONSE TO MOTION TO
DISMISS

Plaintiffs respectfully submit this Response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Doc#14).

Plaintiffs have submitted an Amended Complaint (Doc#15). As a result, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss should be denied as moot. *Mandali v. Clark*, S.D.Ohio No. 2:13-cv-1210, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 143850, at *3 (Oct. 9, 2014) ("The filing of an amended complaint generally moots a pending motion to dismiss."), *citing inter alia Yates v. Applied Performance Techs., Inc.*, 205 F.R.D. 497, 499 (S.D. Ohio 2002).

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Joshua A. Engel
Joshua Adam Engel (OH 0075769)
Scott O'Reilly (OH 0075717)
ENGEL AND MARTIN, LLC
4660 Duke Dr., Suite 101
Mason, OH 45040
(513) 445-9600
engel@engelandmartin.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been electronically served via the Courts ECF system this September 30, 2022 upon all counsel of record.

/s/ Joshua Engel
Joshua Engel